

#5
B4
1-24-96

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket No. 19516/189



In re patent application of

Saigal ASGHAR et al

Serial No. 08/470,003

Filed: June 6, 1995

For: MOTION CONTROLLER ARCHITECTURE

Group Art Unit: 2317

Examiner: M. Meky

AMENDMENT AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed October 16, 1995,
please amend the above-identified application as follows:

REMARKS

Claims 23 and 30-32 stand rejected as anticipated by Cutts. The Office Action relies on Cutts to disclose a memory 14, a first processor 11, a second processor 12 and a first and a second memory within memory 14. Claims 24-25, 27-29, and 33-34 stand rejected as unpatentable over Cutts in view of Nagai. The Office Action admits that Cutts does not disclose the two processors operating independently, but relies on Nagai to disclose a servo system with two independently operated processors 201 and 301. According to the Office Action, it would be obvious to an ordinarily skilled artisan to combine the teaching of Nagai with Cutts to control a system using independent operated processors, in order to increase system functionality. Specifically, the Office Action argues that in Nagai the first processor controls a reel servo and a capstan servo and the second processor controls the function of the drum servo.